



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

| APPLICATION NO.            | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/652,209                 | 09/02/2003  | Nam-II Cho           | 1572.1141           | 8613             |
| 21171                      | 7590        | 05/26/2005           |                     | EXAMINER         |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP         |             |                      | SEVER, ANDREW T     |                  |
| SUITE 700                  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005       |             |                      | 2851                |                  |

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                        |                     |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |
|                              | 10/652,209             | CHO ET AL.          |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |
|                              | Andrew T. Sever        | 2851                |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,6-16 and 18-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,6-16,18-23,25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)          |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the Office action mailed on 11/22/2004 is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.
2. Accordingly the amendment of 2/22/2005 is entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 6-10, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 22, 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen (US 6,833,880.)

Chen teaches in figures 2A, 2B, and 3 a projection television comprising a CRT assembly (250) projecting image beams and first and second casings (see column 2 lines 33-52) provided respectively on opposite sides of the CRT assembly (the actual CRTs) the projection television, further comprising:

A pair of CRT brackets (230a and 230b), provided between the first and second casings, to support the CRT assembly, each CRT bracket comprising:

A CRT combination part (part where the screws are), connected directly to the CRT assembly, and slantly disposed in correspondence with a projecting angle of the

image beams from the CRT assembly (they are clearly at an angle see also figure 3), to project the image beams on a screen, and

A CRT supporting rib (the part extending to the ground of the brackets), connected, at a first end of the CRT supporting rib, directly to a first side of the CRT combination part, to support the CRT combination part.

*With regards to applicant's claims 2, 7, and 8:*

The bracket is attached to the 3<sup>rd</sup> casing via screws or similar attachment (see column 5 lines 37-66)

*With regards to applicant's claim 6:*

Screw holes are shown for directly connecting the CRT combination part to the CRT assembly.

*With regards to applicant's claim 9:*

See figures 5a and 5b, which show grooves 340a for secure fitting of the brackets.

*With regards to applicant's claim 10:*

See figure 3, which shows that the CRT supporting rib is connected directly to the first casing (the first and second casings being the front and back respectively and since no intervening part is shown, figure 3 clearly shows the CRT supporting rib directly connected to the first casing as well as the second.)

*With regards to applicant's claim 12, 14, 20, 22, 23, and 26:*

See column 8 lines 53-67.

*With regards to applicant's claims 15, 16, 18, and 19:*

See above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. Claims 11, 13, 21, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen as applied to claims 1, 2, 6-10, 12, 14-16, 18-20, 22, 23, and 26 above, and further in view of Hobbins et al.

As described in more detail above Chen teaches a projection television with a CRT bracket and third casing, however Chen does not specifically teach the use of EMI blocking material for these components. Hobbins teaches in column 1 lines 17-44 that devices using CRTs need EMI protection as they collect dust and other foreign particles overtime. Given that the accumulation of dust around the CRTs can increase the temperature of the CRTs as well interfere with the light beam being projected resulting in an inferior image in a projection television, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide EMI protection to the brackets as well as the third casing (it is not desirable to have a part of the casing collect dust from an aesthetic point of view).

*Allowable Subject Matter*

8. Claim 24 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Claim 24 claims that the supporting rib is U-shaped, however the supporting rib of Chen is not, further no prior art references were found that did teach such a rib along with a motivation to

make the supporting rib of Chen in that shape. Accordingly claim 24 is indicated as being allowable if written in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Response to Arguments*

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 6-16, and 18-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's arguments concerning the finality are agreed with and finality of the previous final office action has been removed. However applicant's subsequent amendment has caused a new rejection based on new art to have to be prepared and accordingly this rejection is made final.

***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Sever whose telephone number is 571-272-2128. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2851

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AS



JUDY NGUYEN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER